

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/728,580	Applicant(s) DANISHEFSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner Emily Bernhardt	Art Unit 1624	

All Participants:

(1) Emily Bernhardt.

(2) Mr. Gershik.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2005

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
 Rejection(s) discussed:

 Claims discussed:

 Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
 SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet


Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In reviewing applicants' claims in the after final response the examiner indicated that R1 as benzyl is not seen in the original claims or specification, only R4 as benzyl as previously pointed out by applicants. Thus it was agreed to modify the main claims by inserting after "or" in the R1/R4 definition "additionally R4 is". This will be done via an Examiner's Amendment..